

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated October 3, 2006, the Examiner rejects claims 29-50 (all pending claims). In response to the rejections, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Claims 29-50 remain in the Application. In light of the following arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow all of the claims and this Application be allowed.

The Examiner rejects claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,883,956 issued to Le et al. (Le). In order to maintain a rejection the Examiner has the burden of providing evidence of prima facie obviousness. See MPEP §2143. See also In Re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In order to prove prima facie obviousness, the Examiner must provide evidence in the prior art of a motivation to combine or modify a reference, a reasonable expectation of success, and **a teaching of each and every claimed element**. *Id.* *Emphasis added.*

Claim 29 recites “token decryption circuitry in said non-volatile memory to decrypt said encrypted initialization data in said encrypted token wherein said initialization data enables said circuitry in said cryptographic chip to perform encryption and decryption of data for said one of said plurality of cryptographic systems that provides said highest level of security.” Le does not teach this limitation. Instead, Le merely teaches that initialization and/or configuration data is contained in a non-volatile memory. See Col. 3, lines 15-25. In Le, encrypted configuration data may be received from another source. **Software** then performs decryption and verification of the data. Software sets the enabling bit string after the data is verified. See Col. 11, line 10- Col.

12, line 45. Specifically, Le states “...the host software of the computer that houses the SPU invokes a function, referred to herein as the “Load Capability Table.” See Col. 11, lines 34-37. The system in claim 29 actually uses a decryption circuitry to decrypt the initialization data using the cryptographic system that provides the highest level of security. This allows the system of claim 29 to be initialized without outside data and without wasting processing time of a processor. Le does not teach a chip that provides circuitry for more than one encryption system and using the system with the highest level of security to decrypt the initialization data as recited in claim 29. Thus, Le does not teach each and every claimed element and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 29 be removed and claim 29 be allowed.

Claims 30-32 are dependent from claim 29. Therefore, claims 30-32 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 29. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections of claims 30-32 be removed and claims 30-32 be allowed.

Claim 33 recites a method for configuring a cryptographic chip at start-up using the encrypted encryption initialization data that is recited in claim 29. Thus, claim 33 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 29.

Claim 34 is dependent from claim 33. Therefore, claim 34 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 33. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests claim 34 be allowed.

Claim 35 recites a program for providing the method for configuring a cryptographic chip at start-up using the encrypted encryption initialization data that is

recited in claim 29. Thus, claim 35 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 29. Therefore, Applicant requests claim 35 be allowed.

Claim 36 is dependent from claim 35. Therefore, claim 36 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 35. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests claim 36 be allowed.

Claim 37 recites a system for providing the method for configuring a cryptographic chip at start-up using the encrypted encryption initialization data that is recited in claim 29. Thus, claim 37 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 29. Therefore, Applicant requests amended claim 37 be allowed.

Claim 38 is dependent from claim 37. Therefore, claim 38 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 37. Thus, Applicants respectfully request claim 38 be allowed.

Claim 39 recites a method for generating an encrypted token including the encryption initialization data recited in claim 29. Thus, claim 39 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 29. Therefore, Applicant requests that claim 39 be allowed.

Claims 40-42 are dependent from claim 39. Therefore, claims 40-42 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 39. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests claims 40-42 be allowed.

Claim 43 recites a program for providing the method for generating the encrypted token recited in claim 39. Thus, claim 43 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 39. Therefore, Applicant requests that claim 43 be allowed.

Claims 44-46 are dependent from claim 43. Therefore, claims 44-46 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 43. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests claims 44-46 be allowed.

Claim 47 recites a system for providing the method for generating the encrypted token recited in claim 39. Thus, claim 47 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 39. Therefore, Applicant requests that claim 47 be allowed.

Claims 48-50 are dependent from claim 47. Therefore, claims 48-50 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 47. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests claims 48-50 be allowed.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,  
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: January 3, 2007

/william p. wilbar/

William P. Wilbar  
Reg. No.: 43,265

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.  
1657 Hwy. 395, Suite 202  
Minden, NV 89423  
(775) 586-9500  
(775) 586-9550 Fax